

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6964
APPLICANT NAME: Contra Costa Water District
PROJECT TITLE: East Contra Costa County Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Grant

FUNDS REQUESTED: \$ 49,480,000
COST MATCH: \$193,363,200
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$242,843,200

DESCRIPTION: Through development and adoption of a Functionally Equivalent IRWMP, the East County agencies identified a suite of water management projects and programs that, together, will improve water supply reliability and water quality for the region, reduce dependence on imported water, assist in achieving the regional objectives, provide multiple benefits, and eliminate or reduce pollution in sensitive habitat areas and areas of special biological significance. The projects included in this proposal evolved from and are consistent with the Functionally Equivalent IRWMP. The projects accomplish the regional objectives established through the regional planning process, and incorporate multiple water management elements to provide multiple benefits.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The applicant has submitted an FED which has been adopted by all of the participating entities.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The FED consists of 5 regional water management plans and studies which form the basis of the "umbrella document." The FED has a detailed discussion of the region and includes current and future water resources; appropriateness of the area for regional planning; quality and quantity of the water resources; 50-year water supply and demand analysis; important ecological process and environmental resources; social and cultural makeup of the community; and important trends within the region. The mapping provided was detailed and included the necessary details to delineate the internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, major land-use division, hydrological characteristics, and economic distributions. However, there is no mention of social makeup, and the discussion of economic conditions is brief.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The objectives of the planning were well articulated. Major water related objectives and conflicts in the region were also well articulated. The FED identifies the regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined. Major water related objectives are listed, and previously addressed conflicts are briefly mentioned.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The application thoroughly describes each water management strategy that is considered to meet the objectives of the plan. A discussion of how the strategies will work together to achieve objectives and a discussion is provided. There is also discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies. In addition, the plans identify specific projects that will utilize the strategies to meet the objectives.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The FED identified a suite of projects that will be implemented and prioritized them according to short- and long-term implementation. The discussion on the project ranking methodology was detailed, however, the FED did not address how decision making will respond to regional changes; how responses to implementation of projects will be assessed; or how project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses. The methodology for reassessment and prioritization during plan implementation was not articulated.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The FED has well defined actions, projects and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the FED will be implemented. A general timeline was provided for short-term projects, but was missing for long-term projects. The entities responsible for project implementation are identified, as is the interdependence between projects. The current status of each project is listed. The mechanism and institutional structure that will monitor the FED implementation progress could have been more clearly identified.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Regional impacts and benefits are addressed. The anticipated impacts and potential benefits are listed for all 32 projects. DAC issues are addressed. The applicant states that some projects would not be possible on their own, however combined they become feasible with higher benefits. Also, some issues and potential conflicts were reduced or avoided through this regional effort. The advantages of the FED are stated as increased regional understanding, economics of scale, and fostering support within the region. Interregional impacts and benefits were also briefly addressed. However, a more detailed analysis of the negative impacts of not implementing the FED should have been addressed given the effects that the FED could have on the Delta and other proposed IRWMPs. The FED lists fisheries as the only other resource impacted.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The data types (water supply, population, water demand, land use, etc.), technical methods and analysis (hydraulic models, water quality models, species habitat maps and models, etc.) that were used to develop the FED are listed. The data gaps and need for further studies were identified; however, the FED was not specific about how this would be conducted. Project specific metrics will be used to evaluate project performance and project specific monitoring systems will be used to gather performance data. The applicant states that the lead agency and regional management agency will be the mechanism to adapt project operation and plan implementation, but this could have been better articulated.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The FED states that data dissemination to stakeholders and public will occur via websites, written materials, and workshops. It is also stated that as projects included in the FED continue to evolve, details of data management and dissemination will be further developed, and that data will be managed with spreadsheets and or databases as potential tools. There is no mention of who will manage the databases. A more specific discussion of how data will be disseminated to stakeholders and the public was needed. Existing monitoring efforts for water supply and water quality in terms of surface water and groundwater are described. Examples of existing efforts for surface water are given, where groundwater efforts are stated as being needed with no examples of existing efforts provided.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Beneficiaries and potential funding/financing for the projects were identified; however it is uncertain based on the discussion who will make up the difference if State and federal funding are not secured for both implementation and O&M costs. The plan alludes to the concept of "beneficiaries pay" principle as possibly unaffordable at the local level. Many of the projects identify State agencies as potential source of funding.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

4

This FED is intended to be a unifying document for previous local and regional planning efforts. Six plans are listed as examples. The mechanics of the evolution was fully documented in the application. Coordination with local land-use decision-makers was cited although not demonstrated. The water management strategies, projects, and programs originated from local planning studies and plans. The water supply and demand data, objectives, and priorities were developed based on regional planning programs. Methodology for determining prioritization of projects is detailed in Appendix C-1.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Since the FED is intended as an umbrella document, there was not a stakeholder process for the overall IRWMP. The applicant is relying on the process for each of the individual plans. No discussion is given how stakeholders will participate in implementation efforts or how they may influence water management decisions. A table describes mechanisms that will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation for each of the projects.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

The descriptions for the projects were detailed. Project goals and objectives were stated and how they fit into achieving the FED objectives. The rationale provided was sufficient to understand the projects' relationship to the IRWMP. Environmental compliance measures were included in the proposal. Although several projects were identified affecting water quality, the proposal did not detail whether the project are consistent with the applicable RWB Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies. There was no discussion of which NPS management measures will be applied. There was a good list of project-specific performance tracking metrics and monitoring strategies for all 32 projects.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

Ten projects were designated as high priority. The projects relationship to the FED was presented in a sufficient manner. The methodology for determining the prioritization of projects is detailed in Appendix C-1. However, the projects are not prioritized amongst themselves. Environmental compliance measures were included in the proposal. Although several projects were identified as affecting water quality, the proposal did not detail consistency with RWB Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

3

General cost estimates are provided for each project. Cost tables are provided, however, there is no associated narrative. The majority of the project estimates have little or no contingencies budgeted. Two of the construction estimates did not have budgeted items for construction administration. The costs did not completely align with the project descriptions in Attachment 6. For example, for the alternative intake project with a pumping plant and approximately two miles of pipeline, no costs are given for land purchase or easements.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Attachment 8 provides a schedule for the entire proposal and each project. Attachment 8 shows the sequence and timing of the implementation of the proposal. The time increments in the schedules are broken into quarters and state the start and finish time for each task in a project. The number of categories provided depends on the project. Page one states that two projects have monitoring and adaptive management elements that are ongoing, therefore extend beyond the time frame of the schedules. These tasks are listed in the project schedules and finish dates are labeled ongoing. There were some discrepancies between the project descriptions and the schedules.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The explanations for why the projects are top priorities are only a cursory discussion. Some of the projects described associated water management systems, however the proposal is lacking in detail. The five regional water management needs are described, with project descriptions and how the projects meet the stated needs. However, no discussion of regional economic, environmental, and fiscal conditions relative to the need for the proposal is given. In describing the needs for each project, the negative impacts that would result from not completing the proposal are eluded to, although a clear statement of these possible negative impacts is not given.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

8

17% of the population in the region is meets the DAC criterion. An explanation is included of how each project benefited the DACs. However, there was only a short discussion of the communities and any special needs. The proposal could have shown locations of the projects as compared to the DACs. The proposal provides general benefits to the entire region and the DACs. Benefits solely to the DACs are not demonstrated.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The multiple benefits associated with the projects are listed. All projects integrate multiple water management strategies. Five ways are mentioned of how the projects will support and improve regional water supply reliability. The projects will contribute to long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards, and will eliminate or reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas. The projects will provide safer drinking water and improve water quality for DACs.

TOTAL SCORE: 91